
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

MICHAEL ALLEN MATTOX, §
§
Petitioner, §
§
versus § CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:13-CV-189
§
§
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-ID, §
§
Respondent. §

**MEMORANDUM ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Michael Allen Mattox, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court referred this matter to the Honorable Zack Hawthorn, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of the court.

The magistrate judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge concerning this matter. The magistrate judge recommends the petition be dismissed without prejudice for failure to exhaust state habeas remedies.

The court has received the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record, pleadings, and all available evidence. Petitioner filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.

The court has conducted a *de novo* review of petitioner's objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. After careful consideration, the court concludes the objections are without merit. Petitioner acknowledges that the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has not yet ruled on his state application for writ of habeas corpus. As a result, petitioner has not exhausted

his state habeas remedies. Petitioner will be free to refile his petition when the Court of Criminal Appeals rules on his application.

ORDER

Accordingly, petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct and the report of the magistrate judge is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered dismissing the petition.

In addition, the court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a final judgment denying habeas relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See 28 U.S.C. § 2253*. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether he exhausted his state habeas remedies is subject to debate among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions

presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not issue in this matter.

SIGNED at Sherman, Texas, this 20th day of May, 2013.

Marcia A. Crone

MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE